

**TRASFORMAZIONI DELL'EDUCAZIONE:  
PROSPETTIVE DI RICERCA**

**EDUCATION TRANSFORMATIONS:  
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES**

a cura di / editors  
Umberto Margiotta

**With the contribution of / Con i contributi di:**

P. Aiello, M. Banzato, V. Biasi, C. Calleja, C. Cardinali, C. Carnevale, L. Cassone, S. Cescato, L. Collacchioni, P. Cortiana, M. Costa, R. Craia, F. d'Aniello, A. Decarli, M. De Rossi, L. Dordit, F. Dovigo, S. Elia, M. Fedeli, D. Frison, A. Gramigna, P. Hecht, R.B. Kottkamp, U. Margiotta, A. Marzano, G. Nuti, F.M. Melchiori, R. Melchiori, E. Minnoni, V. Morbidelli, E.M. Pace, T. Pezzano, E. Puka, C. Rosa, M. Sibilio, F. Sisti, A. Strano, P. Tosato, M. Valentini, R. Vegliante, E.Vero, E. Zappella

La Rivista è promossa dalla SIREF (Società Italiana per la Ricerca Educativa e Formativa)

Journal classified as "A" by the National Agency for the Evaluation of University and Research (ANVUR)

**DIRETTORE:** UMBERTO MARGIOTTA (Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia)

**COMITATO SCIENTIFICO ITALIA:** G. Alessandrini (Università degli Studi Roma Tre), Massimo Baldacci (Università di Urbino), M. Banzato (Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia), Roberta Caldin (Università di Bologna), L. Binanti (Università del Salento), M. Costa (Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia), P. Ellerani (Università del Salento), Alessandro Mariani (Università di Firenze), R. Melchiori (Università degli Studi Niccolò Cusano), M. Michelini (Università di Udine), A. Nuzzaci (Università dell'Aquila), G. Olimpo (CNR Istituto Tecnologie Didattiche), A. Salatin (IUSVE, Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, associata Pontificio Ateneo Salesiano), F. Tessaro (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

**COMITATO SCIENTIFICO INTERNAZIONALE:** M. Altet (CREN, Université de Nantes), J.M. Barbier (CNAM, Paris), G.D. Constantino (CNR Argentina, CIAFIC), R.M. Dore (Universidad Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil), Y. Engeström (University of Helsinki), L.H. Falik (ICELP, Jerusalem), Y. Hersant (Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Paris), J. Polesel (Department of Education, University of Melbourne), D. Tzuriel (Bar Hillal University, Tel-Aviv), Y. Aguilera (Facultad de Ciencias de Educacion, Universidad Católica de Asunción, Paraguay)

**COMITATO EDITORIALE:** Rita Minello (coordinatrice): PhD in Scienze della Cognizione e della Formazione, Università degli Studi Niccolò Cusano, Roma; Giancarlo Gola: PhD in Teacher education and Development, Università di Trieste; Juliana Raffaghelli: PhD in Scienze della Cognizione e della Formazione, Università di Firenze; Demetrio Ria: PhD in Discipline Storico-Filosofiche, Università del Salento

**COMITATO DI REDAZIONE DEL N. 1/2017:** Maria Luisa Boninelli (Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia), Diana Olivieri (Università degli Studi Niccolò Cusano, Roma), Elena Zambianchi (Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia)

**IMPOSTAZIONE COPERTINA:** Roberta Scuttari (Univirtual, CISRE - Centro Internazionale di Studi sulla Ricerca Educativa e la Formazione Avanzata - Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

**PROGETTO WEB:** Fabio Slaviero (Univirtual, CISRE - Centro Internazionale di Studi sulla Ricerca Educativa e la Formazione Avanzata - Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)

**Codice ISSN 1973-4778 (print) • ISSN 2279-7505 (on line)**  
**Registrazione del Tribunale di Venezia N° 1439 del 11/02/2003**

**ABBONAMENTI:** Italia euro 25,00 • Estero euro 50,00

Le richieste d'abbonamento e ogni altra corrispondenza relativa agli abbonamenti vanno indirizzate a: [abbonamenti@edipressrl.it](mailto:abbonamenti@edipressrl.it)

FINITA DI STAMPARE MARZO 2017



Editore  
Pensa MultiMedia s.r.l.  
73100 Lecce - Via Arturo Maria Caprioli, 8  
tel. 0832/230435 - fax 0832/230896  
[www.pensamultimedia.it](http://www.pensamultimedia.it) • [info@pensamultimedia.it](mailto:info@pensamultimedia.it)

# Referees' evaluation



The journal *Formazione & Insegnamento* started an evaluation system of the articles to be published in 2009, setting up a committee of referees. The Referees Committee's objective is to examine publications and research that may have an academic and scientific value.

In accordance with international guidelines, the journal adopted the following criteria:

- 1. Choice of referees:** the choice is made by the Editor among university teachers and researchers of national and / or international level. The referees' committee is updated annually. At least two members of the referees' committee are chosen among university teachers and researchers belonging to universities or research centers abroad.
- 2. Anonymity of the referees system (double-blind review):** to preserve process integrity of peer review, the authors of the papers do not know the identity of referees. Referees, instead, will know the identity of the authors.
- 3. Evaluation methods:** the Editor will collect the papers of the authors, ensuring that articles meet the technical requirements of the journal (requiring changes and / or additions in case these requirements have not been met). The Editor will, then, make the articles available to the referees using a reserved area within the website of the journal (<<http://www.univirtual.it/drupal/protect>>, "reserved area for referees"). An e-mail from the journal's administration will announce to referees the presence of the items in the reserved area, and which items should be assessed. Referees will read the assigned articles and provide their assessment through an evaluation grid, whose template is made available by the Editor within the restricted area. Referees will be able to fill out the template directly online within the reserved area (through the use of *lime survey* software) within the deadlines set by the Editor. The evaluation will remain anonymous and advice included in it may be communicated by the editorial board to the author of the paper.
- 4. Traceability of the assessment and electronic archive:** the reserved area, within the journal website, is planned and organized in order to have traceability of electronic exchanges between Editor and referees. In addition, evaluated papers and evaluation forms will be also included in an electronic archive within the restricted area. This it allows the Journal to maintain transparency in the procedures adopted, in case of assessments by external assessors and accredited institutions. The latter may require access to the private area to check the actual activation of the evaluation of the papers by the referees' committee.
- 5. Type of evaluation:** referees will express their assessments only through the evaluation template, previously placed in the restricted online area by the Editor of the Journal. Foreign referees will use an English version of the template. The evaluation board consists of a quantitative part (giving a score from 1 to 5 to a series of statements that meet criterias of originality, accuracy, methodology, relevance to readers, and structure of content) and a qualitative part (discursive and analytical judgments about strengths and weaknesses of the paper). In a third part, referees will express approval about the publication of the article, or advice about a publication after revision. In the latter case, referees will be able to provide guidance or suggestions to the author, in order to improve the paper. The evaluation template is available to authors, in order to have transparency of evaluation criteria.
- 6. Limitations of the evaluation:** the referees' power is advisory only: the editor may decide to publish the paper anyway, regardless of the assessment provided by referees (though still taking it into account).
- 7. Acknowledgements to referees:** The list of referees who contributed to the journal is published in the first issue of the following year (without specifying which issue of the journal and for what items) as acknowledgements for their cooperation, and as an instance of transparency policy about the procedures adopted (open peer review).

# La valutazione dei referee

---

La rivista *Formazione & Insegnamento* ha attivato, a partire dal 2009, un sistema di valutazione degli articoli in fase di pubblicazione, istituendo un comitato di *referee*.

Il Comitato dei *referee* si pone l'obiettivo di prendere in esame quelle pubblicazioni e ricerche che possono avere un valore scientifico ed accademico.

In linea con le indicazioni internazionali in materia, la rivista *Formazione&Insegnamento* ha adottato i seguenti criteri:

- 1. Scelta dei referee:** la scelta viene fatta dall'Editor tra i docenti universitari o ricercatori di fama nazionale e/o internazionale. Il comitato dei *referee* viene aggiornato annualmente. Nel comitato dei *referee* vengono scelti almeno due membri tra i docenti universitari e ricercatori stranieri appartenenti a Università o a Centri di ricerca stranieri.
- 2. Anonimia dei referee (sistema "doppio-cieco", double-blind review):** Per preservare l'integrità del processo di revisione dei pari (*peer review*), gli autori dei *paper* candidati non conoscono l'identità dei *referee*. L'identità degli autori sarà invece nota ai *referee*.
- 3. Modalità di valutazione:** L'Editor raccoglierà i *paper* degli autori, avendo cura di verificare che gli articoli rispettino gli aspetti di *editing* della rivista *Formazione & Insegnamento* (richiedendo modifiche e/o integrazioni nel caso che non siano stati rispettati questi aspetti). L'Editor poi fornirà gli articoli ai *referee* tramite l'uso di un'area riservata all'interno del sito della rivista *Formazione & Insegnamento* (<<http://www.univirtual.it/drupal/protect>>, "area riservata *referee*"). Un'e-mail da parte della segreteria redazionale della rivista annuncerà ai *referee* la presenza degli articoli nell'area riservata e quale articolo dovrà essere valutato. I *referee* leggeranno l'articolo assegnato e forniranno la propria valutazione tramite una scheda di valutazione, il cui modello viene predisposto dall'Editor e messo a disposizione all'interno dell'area riservata. I *referee* potranno compilare tale scheda direttamente via web all'interno dell'area riservata (tramite l'uso del software *lime survey*), entro i termini stabiliti dall'Editor. Tale scheda di valutazione rimarrà anonima e i suggerimenti in essa inseriti potranno essere comunicati dalla segreteria redazionale all'autore del *paper*.
- 4. Rintracciabilità delle valutazioni e archivio elettronico:** l'area riservata all'interno del sito della rivista *Formazione&Insegnamento* è stata pensata e organizzata al fine di avere rintracciabilità elettronica degli scambi avvenuti tra l'Editor e i *referee*. Inoltre, tutti i *paper* sottoposti a valutazione e le relative schede di valutazione verranno inseriti in un archivio elettronico, sempre all'interno dell'area riservata del sito della rivista. Ciò permette alla rivista *Formazione&Insegnamento* di mantenere la trasparenza nei procedimenti adottati, anche in vista della possibilità di essere valutata da enti e valutatori esterni accreditati. Questi ultimi potranno richiedere alla Direzione della rivista *Formazione & Insegnamento* la chiave di accesso all'area riservata e constatare l'effettiva attivazione del sistema di valutazione dei *paper* tramite il comitato dei *referee*.
- 5. Tipo di valutazione:** I *referee* dovranno esprimere la propria valutazione esclusivamente tramite la scheda di valutazione, il cui modello è stato disposto dall'Editor all'interno dell'area riservata del sito della rivista. La scheda di valutazione si compone di una parte quantitativa (attribuzione di un punteggio da 1-5 ad una serie di affermazioni che rispondono a criteri di originalità, di accuratezza metodologica, di rilevanza per i lettori, e di correttezza della forma e della buona strutturazione del contenuto) e di una parte qualitativa (giudizi analitici e discorsivi circa i punti di forza e di debolezza del *paper*). In una terza parte i *referee* esprimeranno un giudizio sintetico circa la pubblicabilità o meno dell'articolo o alla sua pubblicabilità con riserva. In quest'ultimo caso, i *referee* potranno infatti fornire indicazioni o suggerimenti all'autore, al fine di migliorare il *paper*. Il *format* di valutazione è accessibile da parte degli autori, allo scopo di rendere trasparenti i criteri di valutazione.
- 6. Limiti nella valutazione:** Il potere dei *referee* è in ogni caso esclusivamente consultivo: l'Editor può decidere di pubblicare o meno il *paper* indipendentemente dal giudizio espresso (anche se comunque ne terrà debitamente conto).
- 7. Ringraziamento ai referee:** L'elenco dei *referee* che hanno collaborato alla rivista viene reso noto nel primo numero dell'anno successivo (senza specificare in quale numero della rivista e per quali articoli) come ringraziamento per la collaborazione fornita e come forma di trasparenza rispetto al procedimento adottato (*open peer review*).

Coordinatore: Prof. Umberto Margiotta, Università Cà Foscari, Venezia

## Esperti invitati per il 2016

Prof.ssa Jenny Aguilera, Università Nazionale di Asunción, Paraguay  
Prof.ssa Giuditta Alessandrini, Università di Roma Tre  
Prof.ssa Marguerite Altet, Università di Nantes, Francia  
Prof.ssa Gloria Alvarez Cadavid, Pontificia Universidad de Colombia  
Prof. Yves André, Università di Grenoble, Francia  
Prof. Paolo Emilio Balboni, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Prof. Massimo Baldacci, Università degli Studi di Urbino  
Dott. Michele Baldassarre, Università di Bari  
Dott.ssa Monica Banzato, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Prof. Jean-Marie Barbier, CNAM, Parigi  
Dott.ssa Barbara Baschiera, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Dott.ssa Isabella Belcari, The National Carlo Collodi Foundation, Collodi  
Prof. Guido Benvenuto, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"  
Prof. Luigino Binanti, Università del Salento  
Dott.ssa Stefania Bocconi, ITD-CNR, Genova  
Prof. Giovanni Bonaiuti, Università degli Studi di Firenze  
Dott. Vincenzo Bonazza, Università Pegaso, Napoli  
Dott. Luca Botturi, SUPSI-Scuola universitaria professionale della Svizzera italiana, Manno, Svizzera  
Dott. Emine Cakir, Faculty of Oriental Studies –University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom  
Prof. Silvana Calaprice, Università degli Studi di Bari  
Dott.ssa Cristiana Cardinali, Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Prof. Attilio Carraro, Università di Padova  
Prof. Antonio Cartelli, Università degli Studi di Cassino  
Prof. Francesco Casolo, Università Cattolica Milano  
Prof. Andrea Cecilianì, Università di Bologna  
Prof. Kostantinos Christou, University of Cyprus, Nicosia  
Dott. Marios Christoulakis, Technical University of Crete, La Canea, Grecia  
Prof.ssa Lerida Cisotto, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Prof. Gustavo Constantino, Pontificia Universidad Catolica, Buenos Aires, Argentina  
Prof. Felice Corona, Università degli Studi di Salerno  
Prof. Massimiliano Costa, Università Cà Foscari, Venezia  
Dott. Sebastiano Costa, Università degli Studi di Messina  
Prof. Antonella Criscenti, Università degli Studi di Catania  
Dott. Giuseppe Cristofaro, Università degli Studi dell'Aquila  
Dott. Anna Maria Curatola, Università degli Studi di Messina  
Prof. Francesca Cuzzocrea, Università degli Studi di Messina  
Prof. Marco Antonio D'Arcangeli, Università degli Studi dell'Aquila  
Prof. Jean David, Università di Grenoble, Francia  
Dott. Orlando De Pietro, Università della Calabria  
Prof.ssa Mina De Santis, Università di Perugia  
Dott.ssa Rosita De Luigi, Università di Macerata  
Dott. Giuseppe De Simone, Università di Salerno  
Dott.ssa Giovanna De Gobbo, Università degli Studi di Firenze  
Dott.ssa Teresa dello Monaco, The Mosaic Art & Sound, London, United Kingdom




Prof. Mario Di Mauro, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Dott. Luciano Di Mele, UniNettuno, Roma  
Dott. Davide di Palma, Università Napoli Partenophe  
Prof.ssa Rose-Mary Dore, Università Federal, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brasile  
Prof. Piergiuseppe Ellerani, Università del Salento  
Dott.ssa Gilda Esposito, Università degli Studi di Firenze  
Prof. Michel Fabre, Università di Nantes, Francia  
Dott.ssa Filomena Faiella, Università di Salerno  
Prof. Ario Federici, Università di Urbino  
Prof. Néstor Fernández Lamarra, Universidad de Tres de Febrero, Buenos Aires, Argentina  
Prof. Reuven Feuerstein, Università di Tel Aviv e ICELP (International Center for Enhancement of Learning Potential) Gerusalemme, Israele  
Prof. Francesco Fischetti, Università di Bari  
Prof. Italo Fiorin, Università LUMSA, Roma  
Prof. Gordon Fisher, Università di Harvard, USA  
Prof.ssa Mariane Frenay, Università Cattolica di Lovanio  
Prof. Paolo Frignani, Università degli Studi di Ferrara  
Dott.ssa Ruxandra Folostina, University of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Valeriu Frunzaru – University of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof.ssa Olga Galatanu, Università di Nantes  
Prof. Luciano Galliani, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Prof.ssa Emma Gasperi, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Prof.ssa Chiara Gemma, Università degli Studi di Bari  
Dott. Carlo Giovannella, Università degli Studi di Tor Vergata  
Prof. Filippo Gomez Paloma, Università di Salerno  
Prof.ssa Anita Gramigna, Università degli Studi di Ferrara  
Prof. Giuseppe Grendene, Università degli Studi di Verona  
Prof. Pascal Guibert, Università di Nantes, Francia  
Prof. Emilio Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Universidad Católica Nuestra Sra. De Asunción, Asunción, Paraguay  
Dott. Raluca Icleanu – SREP-Romanian Society for Lifelong Learning, Bucharest, Romania  
Prof.ssa Ausra Januliene, University of Vilnius, Lituania  
Prof.ssa Maria Jodlowiec, University of Krakow, Poland  
Prof.ssa Monika Kovacs, University of Budapest  
Prof. Alessandra La Marca, Università degli Studi di Palermo  
Dott.ssa Loredana La Vecchia, Università degli Studi di Ferrara  
Prof.ssa Edilza Laray de Jesus, Universidade do Amazonas, Manaus, Brasile  
Prof. Pierpaolo Limone, Università degli Studi di Foggia  
Prof. Mario Lipoma, Università Kore Enna  
Dott.ssa Elena Luppi, Università degli Studi di Bologna  
Prof. Carmelo Majorana, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Lector Iulia Mardare, University of Bucharest, Romania  
Prof. Massimo Margottini, Università di Roma Tre  
Prof. Daniele Masala, Università di Cassino  
Prof. Roberto Melchiori, Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Dott. Francesco Melchiori, Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Dott. Marxiano Melotti Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Prof. Vittorio Midoro, ITD-CNR, Genova  
Prof. Giuseppe Milan, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Dott.ssa Rita Minello, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Dott. Daniele Morselli, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Prof.ssa Luigina Mortari, Università degli Studi di Verona  
Dott. Nektarios Moumoutzis, Technical University of Crete, La Canea, Grecia  
Prof. Anna Maria Murdaca, Università degli Studi di Messina  
Prof.ssa Marinella Muscarà, Università di Enna "Kore"  
Prof. Giorgio Olimpo, ITD-CNR, Genova  
Dott.ssa Patrizia Oliva, Università degli Studi di Messina  
Dott.ssa Diana Olivieri, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Prof.ssa Elisa Palomba, Università del Salento




Prof.ssa Carmen Maria Pandini, Unisul, Florianopolis, Brasile  
Prof. Davide Parmigiani, Università di Genova  
Prof. Francesco Peluso Cassese, Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Prof.ssa Loredana Perla, Università degli Studi di Bari  
Prof. Paolo Peticari, Università di Bergamo  
Prof. Corrado Petrucco, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Dott. Renato Pisanti, Università Niccolò Cusano, Roma  
Dott. Giorgio Poletti, Università degli Studi di Ferrara  
Prof. John Polesel, Università di Melbourne, Australia  
Prof. Agostino Portera, Università degli Studi di Verona  
Dott. Andreas Pitsiladis, Technical University of Crete, La Canea, Grecia  
Prof. Mario Quaranta, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Prof.ssa Daniela Ramos, Università di Santa Catarina, Brasile  
Dott.ssa Juliana E. Raffaghelli, Università degli Studi di Trento  
Dott.ssa Isabella Rega, University of Italian Switzerland, Lugano, Svizzera  
Dott. Manuela Repetto, ITD-CNR, Genova  
Dott. Demetrio Ria, Università del Salento  
Prof. Arduino Salatin, Università IUSVE, Venezia  
Dott. Alessandro Sanzo, Università degli Studi Roma Tre  
Prof.ssa Anna Rita Sartori, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brasile  
Prof. Georges Sawadogo, Università di Koudougou, Burkina Faso  
Prof.ssa Raffaella Semeraro, Università degli Studi di Padova  
Prof. Francesco Sgrò, Università Kore Enna  
Prof. Maurizio Sibilio, Università degli Studi di Salerno  
Prof. Marcello Tempesta, Università del Salento  
Prof. Fiorino Tessaro, Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
Prof. Oscar Parra Trepowsky, Universidad Católica Nuestra Sra. De Asunción, Asunción, Paraguay  
Prof. Domenico Tafuri, Università Napoli Partenophe  
Dott. Paolo Torresan, Santa Monica College, CA  
Prof. Alessandro Vaccarelli, Università degli Studi dell'Aquila  
Prof. Ira Vannini, Università degli Studi di Bologna  
Prof. Alain Vergnioux, Università di Caen, Francia  
Prof. Friedrich Wittib, Pädagogische Hochschule des Bundes Tirol, Innsbruck, Austria  
Dott.ssa Elena Zambianchi – Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia

### **Ringraziamenti**

Il Direttore responsabile e il Comitato scientifico della rivista *Formazione & Insegnamento* esprimono un sentito ringraziamento ai referees anonimi che hanno permesso di migliorare sensibilmente la qualità dei contributi presentati nella rivista.







- 13 **Editoriale / Editorial**  
 by **Umberto Margiotta**  
 Trasformazioni dell'educazione: Prospettive di Ricerca / *Education transformations: Research Perspectives*

**SAGGI / ESSAYS**

- 21 **Fabrizio D'Aniello**  
 Formazione e lavoro oltre lo schema biopolitico / *Training and work beyond the bio-political schema*
- 33 **Anita Gramigna**  
 Educazione per la resistenza. Dialogando con Don Silverio, responsabile governativo dell'educazione degli Yaquim per la salvaguardia della cultura e dell'identità culturale della Tribù / *Education as resistance. Conversing with Don Silverio the institutional responsible officer for Yaquim education for the protection of culture and the cultural identity of the Tribe*
- 47 **Teodora Pezzano**  
 Individuo e democrazia in John Dewey / *Individual and Education in John Dewey*
- 57 **Eskja Vero, Edi Puka**  
 The Importance of Motivation in an Educational Environment/ *L'importanza della motivazione in un ambiente educativo*

**CONTRIBUTI / CONTRIBUTIONS**

- 69 **Valeria Biasi**  
 Didattica digitale e relazione educativa virtuale. Una indagine empirica sull'efficacia dei sistemi audio-video nella didattica on-line per la scuola secondaria di secondo grado e l'università / *Digital learning and virtual educational relationship. An empirical study on the effectiveness of audio-video systems in the on-line teaching for high school and university*
- 81 **Colin Calleja, Robert Kottkamp**  
 Transformative learning: The Transformative Experience of a leader / *Apprendimento trasformativo: l'esperienza trasformativa del leader*
- 101 **Cristiana Cardinali, Rodolfo Craia**  
 Il capitale umano del soggetto deviante: pericolo sociale o risorsa? I programmi europei per la rieducazione e l'inclusione / *The human capital of the deviant person: social risk or resource? The European programs for the re-education and the inclusion*

- 113 Cristina Carnevale**  
 La formazione degli insegnanti. Prospettive di didattica ermeneutico-esistenziale. Un rafforzamento del profilo docente di fronte alle fragilità giovanili esposte alle radicalizzazioni religiose violente / *The possibility of teacher training in hermeneutical-existential teaching: a reinforcement profile of the teachers in front of the youth fragility exposed to violent religious extremism*
- 127 Silvia Cescato**  
 Tutorship e ruolo dei pari nella formazione in servizio di educatori e insegnanti / *Tutorship and peer roles in in-service teachers and educators professional development*
- 139 Luana Collacchioni**  
 La formazione di insegnanti ed educatori. Riflessioni attorno ad un'indagine sugli studenti universitari / *The training of teachers and educators. Reflections regarding a study on university students*
- 153 Paola Cortiana**  
 Promuovere la scrittura attraverso le nuove tecnologie / *Support writing through new technologies*
- 165 Massimiliano Costa**  
 La governance capacitante per lo sviluppo del sistema scolastico / *Enabling governance for the development of the school system*
- 179 Annalisa Decarli**  
 La Philosophy for Community per i lifelong learner / *Philosophy for Community for lifelong learners*
- 193 Marina De Rossi**  
 Questioni metodologiche, soft skill e integrazione delle ICT / *Methodological demands, soft skill and ICT integration*
- 205 Luca Dordit**  
 Il nuovo sistema dell'istruzione e formazione tecnica superiore (ITS) tra luci ed ombre / *The new system of Higher Technical Education and Training in Italy*
- 221 Fabio Dovigo**  
 Costruire una scuola plurale: un'analisi di trent'anni di legislazione sulla scuola primaria in Croazia / *Building a plural school: an analysis of thirty years of primary school legislation in Croatia*
- 243 Sandra Elia**  
 Maria Montessori. Un cambio di paradigma dell'educazione / *Maria Montessori. For a change of educational paradigm*
- 255 Daniela Frison, Monica Fedeli, Erika Minnoni**  
 Il ruolo della riflessione nell'apprendimento degli adulti: rappresentazioni e pratiche nella didattica universitaria e nella formazione / *Adult learning and reflection: assumptions and practices in higher education and training*
- 269 Petra Hecht, Paola Aiello, Erika Marie Pace, Maurizio Sibilio**  
 Attitudes and Teacher Efficacy among Italian and Austrian Teachers: A Comparative Study / *Gli Atteggiamenti e la Teacher Efficacy dei docenti Italiani e Austriaci: Uno Studio Comparativo*
- 283 Antonio Marzano, Rosa Vegliante**  
 Formarsi alla pratica per insegnare: l'esperienza salernitana del laboratorio di Didattica generale e tecnologie didattiche / *Training to teach: the la-*


*boratory experience of General Didactic and Educational Technology at the University of Salerno*


- 305 **Gianni Nuti**  
Musica delle differenze e delle ricchezze. Riflessioni pedagogiche sull'inclusione delle persone con Bisogni Educativi Speciali / *Music of differences and riches. Pedagogical comments on the inclusion of people with Special Educational Needs*
- 319 **Francesco Peluso Cassese, Domenico Tafuri, Davide Di Palma**  
Educazione alla diversità nel contesto scolastico / *Diversity education in the scholastic context*
- 327 **Federica Sisti**  
La teoria "estratta" dalla pratica degli educatori professionali: le scritture educative come unità di analisi / *The theory "extracted" from the practice of professional educators: educational writings as analysis units*
- 339 **Paolo Tosato, Monica Banzato**  
Narrative learning in coding activities: gender differences in middle school / *Apprendimento narrativo in attività di coding: differenze di genere nella scuola di primo grado*
- 355 **Manuela Valentini, Vanessa Morbidelli**  
Gioco e movimento, stimolatori di apprendimenti in età evolutiva / *Play and movement, stimulators of learning in childhood*
- 373 **Emanuela Zappella**  
L'inclusione scolastica degli studenti con Disturbo dello Spettro Autistico: una rassegna degli interventi con il metodo ABA (Analisi Comportamentale Applicata) / *Inclusion of students with ADA in school: A Review of Behaviorally-Based Research Intervention*

#### **DIBATTITO / DEBATE**

- 389 **Laura Cassone**  
Comprendere il male per educare al bene: una prospettiva neuro-pedagogica / *Understanding evil to educate to good: a neuro-pedagogical perspective*
- 399 **Massimiliano Costa, Andrea Strano**  
Imprenditività come leva per il nuovo lavoro / *Intrapreneurship as leverage for new job*
- 413 **Anita Gramigna, Carlo Rosa**  
Il fattore educativo e la violenza dominante / *The education factor and the increasing violence*
- 427 **Roberto Melchiori**  
Le narrazioni interpersonali nel processo di valutazione psicologica. Uno studio di caso / *Interpersonal narratives in the psychological evaluation process. A case study*

#### **COLLABORATORI / CONTRIBUTORS**





# Narrative learning in coding activities: gender differences in middle school

## Apprendimento narrativo in attività di coding: differenze di genere nella scuola di primo grado

Paolo Tosato

Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
tosato@unive.it

Monica Banzato

Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia  
banzato@unive.it

### ABSTRACT

The recent introduction in Italy of Computational Thinking at the primary and secondary levels by the Educational Reform Act (October 2015) raises two critical issues: first, women are underrepresented in the computer field (OECD, 2015a; OECD, 2015b); second, girls lose their interest in computer sciences during adolescence (Gras-Velazquez et al., 2009). Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate gender differences in self-efficacy and engagement through educational narrative methods for learning programming at middle school, a period considered critical in the research literature (Bandura, 1997; Pajares & Schunk, 2001a; Pajares & Schunk, 2001b). This is generally due to a decline in the self-efficacy beliefs of girls in science. Although this is an exploratory study, the implications that emerged show the potential of narrative educational activities to serve as a “cognitive bridge” to engage and improve the self-efficacy of the girls in computational thinking activities.

La comunità scientifica a livello internazionale esprime da tempo preoccupazione sulla questione delle differenze di genere in quanto le donne continuano ad essere sottorappresentate nel settore tecnologico (OCDE 2015). Da diverse ricerche emerge (European Schoolnet, 2013; Bandura, 1977, Pajares, & Schunk, 2001a, b) che le ragazze perdono il loro interesse durante il periodo adolescenziale, momento decisivo nella scelta degli studi superiori, in quanto si registra un declino di self-efficacy e di interesse per l'ambito scientifico. Tale questione risulta cruciale, data la recente Riforma Educativa che prevede l'introduzione del Computational Thinking in tutta la filiera formativa. Pertanto, lo scopo di questo lavoro è di indagare le differenze di genere sulle credenze di self-efficacy e del coinvolgimento percepito in un laboratorio di programmazione, rivolto ad adolescenti tra i 10 e 12 anni, progettato su metodi didattici narrativi. L'obiettivo è di verificare come e quanto tale strategia di apprendimento possa coinvolgere le/gli adolescenti. Sebbene si tratti di uno studio esplorativo, le implicazioni emerse mostrano il potenziale ruolo delle attività narrative come “ponti cognitivi” per coinvolgere e migliorare la self efficacy e il coinvolgimento delle ragazze in attività di programmazione.

### KEYWORDS

Gender difference, Self-efficacy, User engagement, Narrative coding, Computational thinking.

Gender difference, Self-efficacy, User engagement, Narrative coding, Computational thinking.

\* The authors received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

\* For reasons of national assessment of Italian university research, the authors must declare which sections each has written, in spite of the fact that work is entirely the result of continuous and intensive collaboration. “1. Introduction”, “2. Related work gender issues”, “3. Research methodology”, “6. Discussion and limitations of the research” and “7. Conclusions” are by Monica Banzato. Sections “4. Organization of the coding workshop”, “5. Research results” are by Paolo Tosato.

## 1. Introduction

The introduction of computational thinking and coding in primary and secondary schools is one of the innovations introduced by the document *Buona Scuola* (MIUR, 2014) and the Italian Education Reform (MIUR, 2015). At this educational level, the introduction of computational thinking appears to be:

- An unprecedented opportunity, as for the first time, this subject is introduced into the school curriculum for younger children as has already occurred in some other European countries and the wider world (European Schoolnet, 2014). And,
- A strategic challenge, because (1) Italy continues to record low rates of student enrolment to STEM, compared to other European countries, and (2) the gap between boys and girls in the STEM area has widened to the disadvantage of the latter (OECD, 2015a).

According to research conducted for European Schoolnet (Gras-Velazquez et al., 2009), the majority of Italian teenage girls, aged between 13 and 18 years, declare that they like ICT although they do not intend to continue their studies in computer science; in fact, the dropout rate is more than 61%, with female students preferring to study humanities and social sciences. Further, the Italian National Observatory (Alma Laurea, 2012) has reported that only 1.79% of females in Italian universities enrol in computer engineering, compared with 9.9% of males. Overall, 23.04% of women study sciences, compared to 46.07% of men (data processed by Boschetto et al., 2012).

Given that computational thinking is meant to be fully operational in primary and secondary schools within the next three years, it would seem urgent to support the introduction of these studies with practical steps that take into account the known gender inequalities, with the aim of ensuring that these differences do not widen further. There is a vast literature on gender differences and ICT in general (Agosto, 2001; Cooper, 2006; Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008; Heemskerk et al., 2009); however, as claimed by Grover & Pea (2013), Wing (2011), National Research Council (2011), at the level of international research there is still little investigation of gender differences in relation to computational thinking, nor studies that evaluate how disabled students perform in this area. In fact, *“much remains to be done to help develop them to more lucid theoretical and practical understanding of computational thinking in children”* (Grover & Pea, 2013, p. 42).

For this reason, the exploratory survey presented in this paper aims to investigate differences in self-efficacy and learning engagement among students being taught coding. In particular, the research questions are:

- Are there gender differences in students’ beliefs about their own self-efficacy before and after a coding activity?
- Are there gender differences in learning involvement at the cognitive and perceptual levels during coding activities?

The exploratory study was carried out in a workshop on coding that took place in a class at the first level of a lower secondary school. This work was undertaken before the Educational Reform was launched in Italy (July, 2015) and had two purposes: to explore gender differences in the face of this new school subject and to raise awareness of the participation of girls, as well as boys, in computer science.

## 2. Related work gender issues

The international research literature on computing education continues to confirm a concerning under-representation of women in the IT sector (Klawe et al., 2009) and worrying results about gender impact (OECD, 2015b). In the recent past, computer use and activities related to ICT were seen as a field of “male domination” (Brosnan & Davidson, 1996; Panteli et al., 2001) and this issue remains today, despite slight improvements in gender balance (Pechteliadis et al., 2015). However, recent research (OECD, 2015a) confirms the persistence of the gender gap.

Some studies point out that there is a sufficiency of research papers that compare the different uses made of software by males and females (Soe & Yakura, 2008; Howland & Good, 2015). Software environments are important even if it needs to be emphasized that computational thinking can also be done with pen and paper. In any event, it is necessary to pay close attention to learning processes, focusing closely on the cognitive and affective processes that are triggered by various educational activities and taking care to avoid the implicit and explicit transfer of stereotypical gender patterns (Sáinz & Eccles, 2012; Vekiri, 2010).

There are some interesting studies focused precisely on educationally oriented activities, such as the narrative and the game (Baytak & Land, 2011). As has been pointed out by Repenning & Ioannidou (2008), girls experience the traditional teaching of computer science as an unnecessarily complicated way of learning coding, which diminishes their attentiveness to the subject matter. For this reason, the authors propose the use of game design as an educational strategy for exploring informatics, one which engages the interest of both girls and boys. Kelleher & Pausch (2006) demonstrate an increase of girls’ interest in learning to program through involving them in the production of visual stories which are to be implemented later through software. In addition, Van Eck (2006) and Carbonaro et al. (2010) argue that video game design might be a way to engage girls in the study of science, mathematics and computing. The results of Denner et al. (2012) also seem to confirm the educational potential of games for both genders.

The collaborative construction processes involved in programming digital artifacts with computers provide further concrete examples of how it is possible to stimulate student interest and commitment (Teague & Roe, 2008; Kafai, 1996). Baytak & Land (2011) have shown that girls create more scripts and use more instructions than boys, even when the functions can be realized more efficiently with a smaller number of commands. By contrast, a recent study by Howland & Good (2015), who used both narratives and games in teaching coding activities, found that girls typically create more complex and well-developed stories as well as creating more sophisticated scripts than boys. Along the same line, Robertson (2012) confirms the ability of girls to develop more complex games; in particular, they appear much more skilled in some aspects of storytelling. Nevertheless, although a good deal of research into workshops for computational thinking confirms the findings of good performances by girls, much remains to be done to investigate motivational aspects of their work (Howland & Good, 2015). The same Robertson (2013) and Howland & Good (2015) found that despite girls’ declarations of their involvement in games, they felt themselves less involved than the boys. They concluded by declaring that they were less attracted to continue programming activities than the boys and that they did not expect to pursue computer science studies in the future.

To understand this situation better, we considered it essential to investigate aspects of perceptual and cognitive involvement in the learning of coding (User Engagement Scale, O'Brien & Toms, 2010), together with the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). This last measure has been shown in the scientific literature to have a high rate of success in predicting students' future choices. In fact, it is necessary to explore the perceived differences in cognitive capacity and problem-solving ability in girls and boys, and to combine this with affective variables, such as self-confidence, which are often decisive for the selection of future studies and are also a primary source of gender differences with the passing of years ("*... boys and girls report equal confidence during the elementary years but, by middle and high school, boys have grown more confident*" – Pintrich & De Groot, 1990, cite by Pajares & Miller, 1994, p. 196). As the relationship between gender and self-efficacy in the field of computational thinking has not yet been sufficiently explored, this work is intended as a contribution to filling the gap.

### 3. Research methodology

As highlighted in the introduction, this paper aims to answer two research questions:

- Are there gender differences in students' beliefs regarding self-efficacy after a coding activity compared to before?
- Are there gender differences in learning involvement at the cognitive and perceptual levels during coding activities?

To answer these questions, questionnaires were administered: (a) pre-and-post-test on the sense of self-efficacy; (b) post-test on cognitive and perceptual student involvement.

These questionnaires were preceded by the compilation of data on gender and age, on the possession of a home computer, and on computing experience (e.g., Can you access the Internet at home? Which programs do you use? Do you know how to download and launch a program?).

The questionnaire (pre- and post-test) of self-efficacy was based on the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE, Chen et al., 2001), which aims to explain the variance in motivation and performance by measuring the self-efficacy of the students. Bandura defines self-efficacy as "*people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances*" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). In education, self-efficacy has been used for more than four decades (Bandura, 1977). A large number of investigations have amply demonstrated that self-efficacy beliefs are tied to motivational, affective and behavioral results in a variety of domains (Bandura, 1997). Research in this field has shown that students with high self-efficacy are able to persevere longer in their tasks, to demand more significant results from their research, to withstand the anxiety of schoolwork and achieve better results. Students' self-efficacy has been shown to predict achievement in various academic fields, including mathematics, science and writing (Klassen & Usher, 2010; Pajares, 1996; Pajares & Urdan, 2006).

The questionnaire administered to students employed the four-item Likert scale of five steps (ranging along the poll from (5) "completely agree" to (1) "completely disagree"). It investigated four aspects: (i) level of self-efficacy in learning activities and understanding of coding; (ii) expectation of doing well in activities



one chooses to pursue; (iii) security of concluding one's chosen activities successfully; (iv) security of achieving excellent results from the activity of coding. The same questionnaire was administered at the conclusion of the workshop (post-test) in order to check the workshop's impact on the self-efficacy of the students.

The second questionnaire, which was administered after the workshop on coding, was based on the User Engagement Scale (O'Brien & Toms, 2010). It employed the eight-item Likert scale of five steps, ranging from (1) "completely agree" to (5) "completely disagree". This questionnaire was intended to measure the level of students' engagement in their coding activity. User Engagement Scale consists of a wide variety of questions, but for our sample formation and the context in which the activity took place, it was decided to limit the items to eight in order to investigate the following aspects:

- Focused attention, to investigate the students' perception of their concentration levels during the coding session;
- Novelty, to explore how the perceived "newness" of coding affects the students' excitement, curiosity, joy and anxiety;
- Involvement, to verify the students' perception of "*need-based cognitive (or belief) state of psychological identification with some object that is based on an individual's salient needs and perception that the object will satisfy those needs*" (kappelman, 1995, p. 66, cited by o'brien & toms, 2010, p. 19);
- Aesthetics, to investigate the degree to which aesthetic impressions related to the software interface influences students' approval;
- Perceived usability, to explore the students' perception of the difficulty of their coding task.

These measurements were aimed at assessing the differences in effort perceived by boys and girls during the workshop.

To assess the coding operations carried out by students using Scratch software in their workshop (see section 4 "Organisation of the coding workshop" section), desktop video-recording software was installed in the computers. This made it possible to analyze in detail the "actions" and "operations" in the order that the students performed them (for example, their construction of commands, cancellations, mistakes, times when they were unable to continue due to errors, and when they decided to change commands).

#### 4. Organisation of the coding workshop

The software employed in the workshop on coding was Scratch, from the Life-long Kindergarten Group at MIT Media Lab (<https://scratch.mit.edu/about/>). Scratch is a visual programming language with high interaction and sharing of assets, a high sensory and affective involvement (Resnick et al., 2009), and a larger than average range of media functionality (e.g., the ability to insert audio, images and text).

The workshop was carried out at a comprehensive school in the Veneto region of Italy. It involved 20 students from a first-year class in a lower secondary school. In accordance with the research presented in Section 2 above ("Related work gender issues"), laboratory activities were organized to pass through five stages:

First stage. This aimed to capture the students' attention by beginning their activities with Aesop's fable "The Fox and the Crow". The narration served as a

departure point for students to identify characters and actions that would later be realized in Scratch.

Second stage. Students were encouraged to divide themselves into groups of three members each: in the end, there were three groups of girls and four of boys. Each group received Lego WeDo kits provided by the researchers. Students were asked to build a fox with a maximum of 10 pieces.

Third stage. The Scratch program was introduced, pre-installed in laptop computers provided by the researchers. The task was visual storytelling. After explaining the software interface, the students were asked to create a background ("stage") for the fable and to draw the protagonists ("sprites") of the story (the fox, the crow and the cheese). At this stage, the students were left free to express their creativity in the forms and colors for the background and the sprites. The creation of sprites provided an opportunity for a first brief explanation of the Scratch controls; the students were given the opportunity to gain confidence by familiarizing themselves with the controls and verifying on their own the effects that could be created by using them.

Fourth stage. This was the most complex, and the decisive moment, in which we accompanied the students in their planning of the story with Scratch. This phase of the workshop is described in Table 1.

Fifth stage. In the final stage of the workshop, after the realization of the program associated with each character in the story, the robots built by each group were connected to gyroscopes which, in turn, were connected to their computers. This allowed the groups to guide their fox by manipulating the gyroscope. Thanks to their construction of instructions, realized in Scratch, the students managed to move their Lego-built fox (second stage) and visualize its movements on the monitor.

Educational goals	Questions asked students	Activities with Scratch
<b>Define the essential elements of a problem</b>	What are the main actors of the story?	The main story entities are represented by sprites, while the secondary elements, it is not necessary to animate, are placed on the Stage
<b>Identify the actions to be associated with each entities of the problem and when it is necessary to activate them</b>	What do the main actors must do of the story? Which of these characters do they move first? When does the cheese must move? What does the fox have to do while the cheese falls?	Control block (when [] key pressed, broadcast [],when I receive [])
<b>Describe the termination condition of a loop (construct iteration)</b>	When does the cheese have to stop? How far does it must come down?	Control block (repeat until []), sensor suite (touching [])
<b>Use the variables</b>	How does the cheese move down? What is the value of variable y? How to bring the cheese to the starting position each time it starts the program?	Motion commands (x position, y position, change x by [], change y by [], set x to [], set y to [])
<b>Describe the condition to select a block of code to be executed (the construct selection)</b>	When to move the fox right? When to move to left? As a result, which of the sensors value "get up"?	Control block (if []), sensor suite ([tilt] sensor value), operators commands ([] = [])
<b>Distinguish between the input and output of a program</b>	How to make a crow sound? How to clear the cheese eaten by the fox? How to move the cheese from the raven to the fox? How to show that the fox is happy to have taken the cheese? How to move the fox according to the movement of the sensor "tilt"?	Looks block (think [] for [] secs, hide, show), motion commands (change x by [], change y by []), sensor suite ("tilt" sensor value)

Table 1. Educational activities with Scratch

## 5. Research results

### 5.1. Participants and computer usage

A total of 20 students from a secondary school class (first level), comprising 11 males and 9 females, enrolled in this pilot study. The study was held during school hours. The students were aged from 10 to 12, and included 2 foreign females (one of them dyslexic) and 4 foreign males. None of them had had any experience programming before this workshop, except one student who stated that he had previously used Scratch. All but one student had a computer at home, which they used daily to surf the Internet. Normally they used such software programs as a word processor, Google search engine and YouTube (to watch their favorite cartoons and films).

### 5.2. Results regarding changes in self-efficacy

Before analyzing the results, the reliability of the questionnaire was estimated by calculating Cronbach Alfa and obtaining a fair result ( $\alpha = 0.792$ ); this data was confirmed by the corrected item-total correlation, which demonstrated good internal consistency among the questions.

To verify whether the educational activities had produced an improvement in the sense of self-efficacy, a t test for dependent samples was performed on data from 20 students; this revealed that the change (Pre:  $M = 3.925$ ,  $SD = 0.597$ , range 3-4.5; Post:  $M = 4.538$ ,  $SD = 0.521$ , range from 3.25 to 4.75) was statistically significant ( $t(19) = -3.862$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Subsequently, to verify if there were any differences in the sense of self-efficacy before starting the workshop on coding, on the part of the male students ( $n = 11$ ,  $M = 4.068$ ,  $SD = 0.560$ , range 3-5) and the females ( $n = 9$ ,  $M = 3.750$ ,  $SD = 0.625$ , range 3-5), a t-test was performed for independent samples on the pre-test data; this revealed that the difference among the average responses to the questionnaire was not statistically significant ( $t(18) = 1.200$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Figure 1 describes from a graphic point of view the comparison between males and females.




Figure 1. Pre-test: averages and confidence intervals

The same test was performed on the post-test data, again to verify differences in the sense of self-efficacy between males ( $n = 11$ ,  $M = 4.455$ ,  $SD = 0.600$ , range 3.25-5) and females ( $n = 9$ ,  $M = 4.639$ ,  $SD = 0.417$ , range from 3.75-5). This time the difference between the average response to the questionnaire was not statistically significant ( $t(18) = -0,779$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Figure 2 describes the comparison between males and females.




Figure 2. Post-test: averages and their confidence intervals

Although the test does not show differences between males and females, there is an evident improvement in both groups in their sense of self-efficacy, especially in females, with an average of 0.889 points (from 3.750 to 4.639) compared to 0.387 points of males (from 4.068 to 4.455).

The analysis of videos and programs also confirms the results obtained from the questionnaire: both working groups consisting only of males and those consisting only of females have the correct structure in their programs, sometimes making mistakes (corrected independently or with support of researchers), sometimes making appropriate customizations to the software. Probably it is this equality in the results that led the girls to increase their sense of self-efficacy more than boys. Although there are no indicators that confirm this hypothesis, it is plausible to believe that the girls would feel less safe and they had lower expectations of doing well in the activity of coding than their male colleagues, an expectation then denied by the laboratory results. This may have gratified the female students, who could see themselves performing at the same level as their male counterparts.

Through analysis of the video one can also determine that there was greater commitment and greater concentration on the part of the girls in the course of their work than the boys, who were distracted more easily, which was manifested in greater discontinuity of attention. This commitment, coupled with the success in carrying out the activity, may have produced in the female students a higher confidence in their effectiveness.

### 5.3. Results regarding cognitive and emotional engagement

After the workshop on coding a questionnaire was administered to the children, which was based on User Engagement Scale (O'Brien & Toms, 2010), to measure the degree of student involvement in the activity of coding. The research collected data on the following aspects: focused attention, novelty, involvement, aesthetics, perceived usability. The questions to which the children responded are shown in the following table (Table 2).

Aspects analysed	Items
<b>Focused attention</b>	1. I was so involved in my programming job in Scratch that I ignored everything around me 2. I was so involved in my programming task in Scratch that I lost track of time
<b>Novelty</b>	3. The programming tasks aroused my curiosity 4. I discovered in this activity that I like to programming
<b>Involvement</b>	5. I had a lot of fun doing the programming
<b>Aesthetics</b>	6. I liked the graphics and images used in Scratch
<b>Perceived usability</b>	7. I found it hard to program in Scratch 8. I felt discouraged while using Scratch

Table 2. User Engagement questionnaire

#### Hypotheses

This study aims to determine whether there is a gender difference in the cognitive involvement of students in coding activities. In order to verify statistically whether there are differences between the medians of the scores obtained in the two populations, the following variables are defined:

- Independent variable: gender (nominal, dichotomous: male, female);
- Dependent variable: user engagement (score of the questionnaire based on user engagement scale: the score of each student is the average of the scores expressed in each item).

If there are differences between the male and female populations, we should be able to reject the following assumption:

H0: the median of the population from which the sample of males is extracted is equal to the median of the population from which the sample of females is extracted: therefore, there is not a gender difference in cognitive student involvement.

#### Results

The class in which the experiment took place is from the first level of a lower secondary school; it was composed of 20 students aged between 10 and 12 years.

From this group, two independent samples were created: one of 11 males and the other of 9 females.

Given the very small size of the samples, we decided to use the Mann-Whitney statistical test to analyze the results. This allows comparison of the medians of two independent samples (table 3).

Ranks				
	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Engagement	M	11	8.73	96.00
	F	9	12.67	114.00
	Total	20		

**Table 3. Comparison of the medians of two independent samples (Mann-Whitney statistical test)**

Table 3 indicates which group is judged to have the higher level of engagement; this corresponds to the one with the highest average ranking. In this case, the female sample would appear to demonstrate a greater involvement in the activity of coding.

Test Statistics <sup>b</sup>	
	Engagement
Mann-Whitney U	30.000
Wilcoxon W	96.000
Z	-1.494
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.135
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.152 <sup>a</sup>
Exact Sig. (2-tailed)	.145
Exact Sig. (1-tailed)	.072
Point Probability	.007
a. Not corrected for ties.	
b. Grouping Variable: gender	

**Table 4. The results of the Mann-Whitney test**

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney test ( $U = 30$ ) and the relevant probability ( $p = 0.145$ ), which corresponds to Exact Sig. (2-tailed). Through this value, following the procedure described by Rosenthal & Rubin (2003), it was possible to calculate the effect size  $r_{equivalent}$  amounting to a value of 0.34, interpreted as a moderate effect size (Cohen, 1988).

## Data analysis

Taking into consideration the results reported in the previous section, although it seems that girls have a greater cognitive engagement, it is not unlikely that the observed data is the result of a true null hypothesis ( $H_0$  given in section 5.3.1 “Hypotheses”): this is why we accept it. The results suggest that most likely the male population ( $n = 11$ , median = 4.3,  $Q1 = 4.0$ ,  $Q3 = 4.4$ ) has a median score in the questionnaire concerning user engagement equal to that of the female population ( $n = 9$ , median = 4.5,  $Q1 = 4.3$ ,  $Q3 = 4.8$ ); therefore there is no empirical evidence of a gender difference ( $U = 30$ ,  $z = -1.494$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.34$ ). Figure 3 depicts the comparison between males and females from a graphical point of view.




Figure 3. Comparison of males and females

## 6. Discussion and limitations of the research

The results revealed that there are no significant differences between males and females. This confirms the conclusions of other studies which have examined similar situations. In fact, the girls did not seem to underestimate their capacity to code and, in fact, in the post-test questionnaire, they reported a greater sense of self-efficacy than did the boys. If, as Joët et al. (2011, p. 659) opines, “Beliefs held become rules for future actions, which may have implications for girls’ academic trajectory and, ultimately, the careers they pursue”.

Due to the time constraints of the workshop and the relatively small sample of students, we believe that this conclusion should be stated as potential rather than asserted with a high degree of confidence. Longitudinal studies are needed to confirm this possibility.

From analysis of the girls’ answers, it seems that they interpret questions of self-efficacy in an adaptive mode. Comparison of pre- and post-test results (in which females report slightly higher results than males), especially as regards their perceived mastery of skills (also confirmed by the User Engagement Scale results), suggests that these beliefs could help them visualize their capacities in a favorable manner. We were very struck by these positive results and questioned ourselves at length on how to interpret them. We concluded that there

were a number of particularly favorable conditions. Firstly, the coding workshop was a novel experience which they had never previously experienced, in or out of school. Secondly, it pertained to a unique genre not associated with any particular subject that they had encountered before, in or out of school. We may infer that the coding workshop belongs to a “new” field, in which males and females work together from the outset. From these facts, we hypothesize that not having previously formed explicit or implicit beliefs about gender stereotypes (from family, friends or teachers), the girls did not have any beliefs that coding is for males and the boys did not have any beliefs that this activity was particular to males.

Another important psychological factor to take into consideration is that of gender differences linked to developmental levels. Several studies show that the differences between males and females begin to emerge in the transition of children from primary to secondary school (Eccles & Midgley, 1989; Wigfield et al., 1991; Wigfield et al., 1996; Pajares & Schunk, 2001a). At this stage “*the girls [are] generally showing a decline in self-efficacy beliefs*” (Pajares & Schunk, 2001b, p. 11). Since our sample of students (11-12 years old) is located exactly at this stage of passage, we consider that this element might have affected the results, even if (and this is another limit) we could not go deeper with further analysis of the effect of this transition on the sense of self-efficacy.

In order to generalize the results of this study, one would need to compare the attitudes and beliefs of students regarding scientific versus humanities studies. This is because the workshop sought to create a bridge between narrative (verbal and visual) and computational thinking. The study of relationships between attitudes should be undertaken in regard to beliefs about academic achievement and cognitive performance, such as the ability to solve more complex problems over time, the ability to transfer and generalize solutions, and the exercise of spatial skills.

The general feedback of the class, which we also addressed in a previous study (Banzato & Tosato, 2017), was very positive, and the students explicitly requested to continue training in the following weeks. We hypothesized, however, that this was mainly caused not only by the novelty (also confirmed by the results of the questionnaire User Engagement Scale) but also from the interruption in the routine of class lessons, the absence of pressure from the evaluation to effect measures of school performance, and the fact that the activity took place in a climate of “experimentation”, or as the students proudly put it: “these are adult activities” (Banzato & Tosato, 2017).

We maintain that our exploratory study could serve as the basis for research that was re-imagined, modified and repeated under realistic conditions, that is to say in a number of larger and regular classes, for a longer period of time and with other activities that are counted in the students’ final evaluations.

## Conclusion

Drawing inspiration from earlier research (reported in section 2 “Related work gender issues”), in the workshop design we tried to contextualize the computational activities through three stages in order to capture students’ creativity: verbal narration (listening to a story); construction of a manual artefact (building the fox with Lego WeDo); visual storytelling (designing the story with Scratch programming language). The combination of these three phases was highly motivat-



ing; it allowed the students to move gradually from the “narrative thoughts” to the basics of “computational thinking”, thereby taking their first steps in the coding process. Our results are supported by the theory of Bandura (1997) and the empirical results of other research, which shows “*perceived mastery experience is a powerful source of self-efficacy across academic domains*” (Usher & Pajares, 2008, cited by Joët et al., 2011, p. 658). As Bandura (1997, p. 81) states, “*the same level of performance success may raise, leave unaffected, or lower perceived self-efficacy depending on how various personal and situational contributions are interpreted and weighted*”.

Ultimately, our results are encouraging from a gender perspective. There are many studies that have focused on finding ways to encourage girls to engage with coding (Baytak & Land, 2011; Burge et al., 2013) but few directly compare the relative performance of gender self-efficacy and user engagement. Observing the students’ behavior during the workshop, we noticed that in the first phase of coding the girls were more diligent and methodical in writing scripts than boys. The girls followed the explanations of researchers and applied themselves immediately, while some of the boys preferred to seek autonomous solutions for implementing the script, even if this caused them to pause frequently.

After this first stage of contact with the Scratch program, some of the girls tried on their own to program the script and asked the researchers to check their alternatives; in contrast, the boys moved from bench to bench to verify their solutions with the other classmate and only as a last resort sought information from the researchers.

Unlike other exploratory studies (Carbonaro et al., 2010; Kelleher et al., 2007), at the end of the workshop we did not find significant differences in the complexity of the script produced independently by the boys and girls (possibly due to the few hours available), but we did find that the girls made more requests for help and obtained greater gratification from their results.

In accordance with Kelleher et al. (2007) and Howland & Good (2015), we found that utilizing a narrative which is both verbally and visually attractive motivates both boys and girls in their coding activities.

Noting in the data collected on self-efficacy and user-engagement better results for girls, and taking account of the PISA data (OECD, 2013), which records better performance in literacy by girls at both primary and secondary levels, we suspect that the use of narrative by the girls has raised their performance on the cross-domain level. This effect is also pointed out by Howland & Good (2015). Put another way, it is likely that the girls having started from an area in which they felt at ease (the narrative) were led to commit themselves and to engage in an “unknown” area such as programming. When examining the visual narratives of students, we noticed that the girls had created more detailed and aesthetically pleasing drawings and that they had dedicated more time and attention to this aspect of their work. We also noticed, at the end of the workshop, that the girls had produced unnecessarily detailed scripts, while other girls had produced more alternative scripts than the boys. These observations require further research and would certainly be interesting to investigate.

Finally, more research is needed to explore (at this early stage of the introduction of computational thinking in Italian schools) the relationship between teachers’ and students’ self-efficacy, in order to better understand the influence of the psycho-social environment on academic self-beliefs of children and their effects on the gender issue.

## References

- Agosto, D. E. (2001). Propelling Young Women into the Cyber Age: Gender Considerations in the Evaluation of Web-based Information. *School Library Media Research*, 4.
- Alma Laurea (2012). *XIII Indagine sulla Condizione Occupazionale dei Laureati*. Retrieved February 2012, from <http://www2.almalaurea.it/cgiphp/universita/statistiche/tendine.php?anno=2010&config=occupazione>.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review* 84 (2): 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1994). *Self efficacy*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Banzato, M., & Tosato, P. (2017). An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Self-Efficacy and Learning Engagement in Coding Learning Activities in Italian Middle School. *AACE – International Journal on E-Learning (IJEL)* 17 (1).
- Baytak, A., & Land, S. M. (2011). CASE STUDY: Advancing Elementary-School Girls' Programming through Game Design. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(1).
- Boschetto, E., Candiello, A., Cortesi, A., & Fignani, F. (2012). *Donne e Tecnologie Informatiche*. Retrieved August 2016, from [http://www.bollettinoadapt.it/old/files/document/22348regione\\_veneto\\_0.pdf](http://www.bollettinoadapt.it/old/files/document/22348regione_veneto_0.pdf).
- Brosnan, M. J., & Davidson, M. J. (1996). Psychological gender issues in computing. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 3(1), 13-25.
- Burge, J. E., Gannod, G. C., Doyle, M., & Davis, K. C. (2013, March). Girls on the go: a CS summer camp to attract and inspire female high school students. In *Proceeding of the 44th ACM technical symposium on Computer science education* (pp. 615-620). ACM.
- Carbonaro, M., Szafron, D., Cutumisu, M., & Schaeffer, J. (2010). Computer-game construction: A gender-neutral attractor to Computing Science. *Computers & Education*, 55(3), 1098-1111.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational research methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Cooper, J. (2006). The digital divide: The special case of gender. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 22.5 (2006): 320-334.
- Denner, J., Werner, L., & Ortiz, E. (2012). Computer games created by middle school girls: Can they be used to measure understanding of computer science concepts? *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 240-249.
- Eccles, J. S., & Midgley, C. (1989). Stage-environment fit: Developmentally appropriate classrooms for young adolescents. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education* (Vol. 3, pp. 139-186). San Diego: Academic Press.
- European Schoolnet (2014). *Computing our future. computer programming and coding priorities, school curricula and initiatives across Europe*. Technical report European Schoolnet.
- Gras-Velazquez, A., Joyce, A., & Debry, M. (2009). Women and ICT: Why are girls still not attracted to ICT studies and careers. *White paper developed for European Schoolnet (EUN Partnership AISBL)*.
- Grover, S., & Pea, R. (2013). Computational Thinking in K–12 A Review of the State of the Field. *Educational Researcher*, 42(1), 38–43.
- Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality differences in young adults' use of the Internet. *Communication Research*, 35(5), 602-621.
- Heemskerck, I., ten Dam, G., Volman, M., & Admiraal, W. (2009). Gender inclusiveness in educational technology and learning experiences of girls and boys. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 41(3), 253-276.

- Howland, K., & Good, J. (2015). Learning to communicate computationally with Flip: A bimodal programming language for game creation. *Computers & Education*, 80, 224-240.
- Joët, G., Usher, E. L., & Bressoux, P. (2011). Sources of self-efficacy: An investigation of elementary school students in France. *Journal of educational psychology*, 103(3), 649.
- Kafai, Y. B. (1996). Gender differences in children's constructions of video games. In P.M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (eds.), *Interacting with Video* (pp. 39-66). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Kappelman, L.A. (1995). Measuring user involvement: A diffusion of innovation perspective. *Database Advances*, 26(2/3), 65-86.
- Kelleher, C., & Pausch, R. (2006, September). Lessons learned from designing a programming system to support middle school girls creating animated stories. In *Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing, 2006. VL/HCC 2006. IEEE Symposium on* (pp. 165-172). IEEE.
- Kelleher, C., Pausch, R., & Kiesler, S. (2007, April). Storytelling alice motivates middle school girls to learn computer programming. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1455-1464). ACM.
- Klassen, R. M., & Usher, E. L. (2010). Self-efficacy in educational settings: Recent research and emerging directions. *Advances in motivation and achievement*, 16, 1-33.
- Klawe, M., Whitney, T., & Simard, C. (2009). Women in computing—take 2. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(2), 68-76.
- MIUR (2014, July 25). *La Buona Scuola. Facciamo crescere il Paese* [online]. Retrieved August 2016, from: <https://labuonascuola.gov.it/documenti/La%20Buona%20Scuola.pdf?v=d0f805a>
- MIUR (2015). *Riforma del sistema nazionale di istruzione e formazione e delega per il riordino delle disposizioni legislative vigenti*. Gazzetta Ufficiale (LEGG 13 luglio 2015, n. 107).
- National Research Council (2011). *Committee for the Workshops on Computational Thinking: Report of a workshop of pedagogical aspects of computational thinking*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- O'Brien, H. L., & Toms, E. G. (2010). The development and evaluation of a survey to measure user engagement. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(1), 50-69.
- OECD (2013). *Pisa 2015 Draft Reading Literacy Framework*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- OECD (2015a). *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2015-en>
- OECD (2015b). *The ABC of Gender Equality in Education: Aptitude, Behaviour, Confidence*. PISA, OECD Publishing. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264229945-en>
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs and mathematical problem-solving of gifted students. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 21(4), 325-344.
- Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1994). Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: A path analysis. *Journal of educational psychology*, 86(2), 193.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001a). The development of academic self-efficacy. *Development of achievement motivation. United States*, 7.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001b). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. *Perception*, 11, 239-266.
- Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. C. (2006). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*. IAP.
- Panteli, N., Stack, J., & Ramsey, H. (2001). Gendered patterns in computing work in the late 1990s. *New technology, work and employment*, 16(1), 3-17.
- Pechtelidis, Y., Kosma, Y., & Chronaki, A. (2015). Between a rock and a hard place: women and computer technology. *Gender and Education*, 27(2), 164-182.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
- Repenning, A., & Ioannidou, A. (2008, March). Broadening participation through scalable game design. In *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin* (Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 305-309). ACM.
- Resnick, M., Maloney, J., Monroy-Hernández, A., Rusk, N., Eastmond, E., Brennan, K., Miller, A., Rosenbaum, E., Silver, J., Silverman, B., & Kafai, Y. (2009). Scratch: programming for all. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(11), 60-67.

- Robertson, J. (2012). Making games in the classroom: Benefits and gender concerns. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), 385-398.
- Robertson, J. (2013). The influence of a game-making project on male and female learners' attitudes to computing. *Computer Science Education*, 23(1), 58-83.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (2003).  $r$ (equivalent): A simple effect size indicator. *Psychological Methods* 8, no. 4: 492-496.
- Sáinz, M., & Eccles, J. (2012). Self-concept of computer and math ability: Gender implications across time and within ICT studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 486-499.
- Soe, L., & Yakura, E. K. (2008). What's wrong with the pipeline? Assumptions about gender and culture in IT work. *Women's Studies*, 37(3), 176-201.
- Teague, D., & Roe, P. (2008, January). Collaborative learning: towards a solution for novice programmers. In *Proceedings of the tenth conference on Australasian computing education*. Volume 78 (pp. 147-153). Australian Computer Society, Inc.
- Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 751-796.
- Van Eck, R. (2006). Using games to promote girls' positive attitudes toward technology. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 2(3), 6.
- Vekiri, I. (2010). Boys' and girls' ICT beliefs: Do teachers matter? *Computers & Education*, 55(1), 16-23.
- Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., & Pintrich, P. R. (1996). Development between the ages of 11 and 25. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 148-185). New York: Macmillan
- Wigfield, A., Eccles, J., Maclver, D., Reuman, D., & Midgley, C. (1991). Transitions at early adolescence: Changes in children's domain-specific self-perceptions and general self-esteem across the transition to junior high school. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 552-565.
- Wing, J. M. (2011, March). Computational thinking. *VL/HCC* (p. 3).